UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/665,290 | 09/22/2003 | Ingemar Soderquist | 69993-254193 | 5630 |
| 26694 VENABLE LLI | 7590 09/03/200 P | | EXAMINER | |
| P.O. BOX 3438 | | FENNEMA, ROBERT E | | |
| WASHINGTO | N, DC 20043-9998 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2183 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/03/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| 10/665,290 | SODERQUIST ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| ROBERT E. FENNEMA | 2183 | |
| | 10/665,290 Examiner | 10/665,290 SODERQUIST ET A Examiner Art Unit |

| | ROBERT E. FENNEMA | 2183 | |
|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>24 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE c). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount or dension are dension and dension and dension are de | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropria | n. LED WITHIN TWO e extension fee ate extension fee |
| under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | s of the date of appeal. Since a |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) They are not deemed to place the application in between the contract of the c | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | E below); | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | · |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) | · | - | - |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | ided below or appended. | | Apranation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 10</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | ıl and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /Eddie P Chan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2183 | | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to the claims would require a new search and consideration of the subject matter, and thus are not being entered at this time.

Continuation of 10: An additional search and consideration would be required, due to the change in scope of the claims. However, Examiner notes that in Line 9 of Claim 1, a "delay operand" is missing. Additionally, Examiner believes that in the response to this action, as noted in the Final Rejection, it would be advisable to provide a definition for the term "delay operand" to ensure that it will overcome the reference. The words "delay operand" by itself does not mean a great deal, and while it is narrower than "time performance constraints", it is broad enough such that Dhuey may in fact still read upon it, but without a further consideration of the reference, Examiner cannot state that with certainty at this time, but providing a short definition or description in the claims as to what a delay operand is or does would likely be a far more productive amendment in the Examiners opinion, and be far more likely to advance prosecution